HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administrat
P. O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

06-01-04

AF/2613

PATENT APPLICATION

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 10012397-1

IN THE
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

4/12
6-9-04
P.2.

Inventor(s):	David H. Hanes	**Confirmation No.:**	2563
Application No.:	09/910,970	**Examiner:**	Jamie J. Vent
Filing Date:	July 20, 2001	**Group Art Unit:**	2613
Title:	SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR DETECTING THE BORDER OF RECORDED VIDEO DATA		

Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents
Commissioner For Patents
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TRANSMITTAL OF APPEAL BRIEF

Sir:

Transmitted herewith in **triplicate** is the Appeal Brief in this application with respect to the Notice of Appeal filed on **April 5, 2004**.

The fee for filing this Appeal Brief is (37 CFR 1.17(c)) $330.00.

(complete (a) or (b) as applicable)

The proceedings herein are for a patent application and the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a) apply.

( ) (a) Applicant petitions for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136 (fees: 37 CFR 1.17(a)-(d) for the total number of months checked below:

( )	one month	$110.00
( )	two months	$420.00
( )	three months	$950.00
( )	four months	$1480.00

( ) The extension fee has already been filled in this application.

(X) (b) Applicant believes that no extension of time is required. However, this conditional petition is being made to provide for the possibility that applicant has inadvertently overlooked the need for a petition and fee for extension of time.

Please charge to Deposit Account **08-2025** the sum of **$330.00**. At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any fees required or credit any over payment to Deposit Account 08-2025 pursuant to 37 CFR 1.25. Additionally please charge any fees to Deposit Account 08-2025 under 37 CFR 1.16 through 1.21 inclusive, and any other sections in Title 37 of the Code of Federal Regulations that may regulate fees. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

"Express Mail" label no. **EV 397447185 US**

Date of Deposit **5/28/2004**

I hereby certify that this is being deposited with the United States Postal Service "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" service under 37 CFR 1.10 on the date indicated above and is addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

By Joan Farragher

Typed Name: **Joan B. Farragher**

Respectfully submitted,

David H. Hanes

By James L Baudino

James L. Baudino

Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. **43,486**

Date: **5/28/2004**

Telephone No.: **214.855.7544**

DOCKET: 10012397-1

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPEAL FROM THE EXAMINER TO THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

In re Application of:	David H. Hanes
Serial No.:	09/910,970
Filing Date:	July 20, 2001
Group Art Unit:	2613
Examiner:	Jamie J. Vent
Title:	SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR DETECTING THE BORDER OF RECORDED VIDEO DATA

MAIL STOP: APPEAL BRIEF-PATENTS
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

APPEAL BRIEF

Applicant has appealed to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences from the decision of the Examiner mailed January 2, 2004 finally rejecting Claims 1-20 and 22-40. Applicant filed a Notice of Appeal on April 5, 2004. Applicant respectfully submits herewith this Appeal Brief, in triplicate, with authorization to charge the statutory fee of $330.00.

REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The present application was assigned to Hewlett-Packard Company as indicated by an assignment from the inventor recorded on January 9, 2002 in the Assignment Records of the United States Patent and Trademark Office at Reel 012455, Frame 0628. The present application was subsequently assigned to Hewlett-Packard Development Company, L.P. as indicated by an assignment from Hewlett-Packard Company recorded on September 30, 2003 in the Assignment Records of the United States Patent and Trademark Office at Reel 014061, Frame 0492.

RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

There are no known appeals or interferences that will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in this pending appeal.

STATUS OF CLAIMS[1]

Claims 1-20 and 22-40 stand rejected pursuant to a Final Office Action mailed January 2, 2004. Claims 1-20 and 22-35 are presented for appeal.

STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

Applicant filed a Response Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.116 on February 19, 2004, in response to the Final Office Action mailed January 2, 2004. The Examiner issued an Advisory Action dated March 11, 2004, stating that claims 1-20 and 22-40 continue to stand rejected as stated in the Final Office Action. Applicant filed a Supplemental Response Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 on April 30, 2004, canceling claims 36-40.

SUMMARY OF INVENTION

The present invention involves a system and method for detecting the border of video data having recorded data content. The system (10) comprises a border detection module (30) for receiving a plurality of video frames (200) from a video data source (20) where the received video frames (200) comprise unrecorded data

[1] The Examiner's Final Office Action indicates and maintains a rejection of claims 1-40, but Applicant canceled claim 21 without prejudice or disclaimer in a response filed September 24, 2003. To avoid any confusion, previously canceled claim 21 is not presented for appeal.

content (201-203, 204-205) and recorded data content (210) (page 3, lines 17-28, page 6, lines 15-25, figure 2). The border detection module (30) is adapted to identify at least one frame (203, 204) of the unrecorded data content (201-203, 204-205) as a border of the recorded data content (210) (page 4, lines 8-9, page 6, lines 15-25 and 31, page 7, lines 1-3, figure 2).

STATEMENT OF ISSUES

1. Are claims 1-7, 9-13, 15-19, 22-29 and 31-35 unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,812,732 issued to Dettmer et al. ("*Dettmer*")?

2. Are claims 8, 14, 20 and 30 unpatentable under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) in view of *Dettmer* in combination with U.S. Patent No. 5,343,251 issued to Nafeh ("*Nafeh*")?

GROUPING OF CLAIMS

1. Group 1: Claims 1-7, 9-13, 15-19, 22. Claims 2-7 depend from independent claim 1. Claims 10-13 depend from independent claim 9. Claims 16-19 and 22 depend from independent claim 15.

2. Group 2: Claims 23-28. Claims 24-28 depend from independent claim 23. Claims 23-28 recite additional and separately patentable elements that are not taught, disclosed or suggested in the cited art. In particular, independent claim 23 recites "logic adapted to compare at least two video frames of the video data" and "identify at least one of the two video frames as a border between unrecorded data content of the video data and recorded data content of the video data if pixel values of the at least one of the two video frames corresponds substantially to a particular color."

3. Group 3: Claims 29 and 31-35. Claims 31-35 depend from independent claim 29. Claims 29 and 31-35 recite additional and separately patentable elements that are not taught, disclosed or suggested in the cited art. In particular, independent claim 29 recites "logic adapted to compare at least two video frames of the video data" and "identify at least one of the two video frames as a

border between unrecorded data content of the video data and recorded data content of the video data if an amount of motion in one of the at least two video frames exceeds a predetermined threshold relative to another one of the at least two video frames."

4. Group 4: Claims 8, 14, 20 and 30. Claim 8 depends from independent claim 1. Claim 14 depends from independent claim 9. Claim 20 depends from independent claim 15. Claim 30 depends from independent claim 29. Claims 8, 14, 20 and 30 recite additional and separately patentable elements that are not recited in their respective base claims and not taught, disclosed or suggested in the cited art. In particular, claims 8, 14 and 20 recite "analyz[ing] motion vectors created from at least one of the plurality of video frames" and "determin[ing] from the motion vectors the at least one frame of unrecorded data content," and claim 30 recites "analyz[ing] motion compensation vectors to determine the amount of motion." Claims 8, 14, 20 and 30 are patentable over the cited art whether or not their respective base claims are patentable.

Applicant submits that the explanations provided in this section and in the Argument section do not merely point out differences between the claims, but present arguments as to the separate patentability of each claim as required by 37 C.F.R. § 1.192(c)(7) and M.P.E.P. § 1206.

ARGUMENT

A. Standard

Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1051 (Fed. Cir. 1987); M.P.E.P. § 2131. In addition, "[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the . . . claims" and "[t]he elements must be arranged as required by the claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 U.S.P.Q.2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989); *In re Bond*, 15 U.S.P.Q.2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990); M.P.E.P. § 2131.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met: First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings; second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success; and finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, (Fed. Cir. 1991); M.P.E.P. § 2143. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on applicant's disclosure. *Id.* Further, the mere fact that references can be combined or modified does not render the resultant combination obvious unless the prior art also suggests the desirability of the combination. *In re Mills*, 916 F.2d 680 (Fed. Cir. 1990); M.P.E.P. § 2143.01.

B. Issue 1: Claims 1-7, 9-13, 15-19 and 22 (Group 1) are patentable over *Dettmer*.

Claims 1-7, 9-13, 15-19 and 22 (Group 1) stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Dettmer*. Of these claims, claims 1, 9 and 15 are independent. Applicant respectfully submits that each independent claim is patentable over *Dettmer*, and thus remaining claims 2-7, 10-13, 16-19 and 22 which depend from the independent claims, are also patentable.

Generally, the present invention involves a system and method for detecting a border between video frames that do not contain recorded material (e.g., video frames that are usually displayed on a video output as a solid color or snow, which is a random-pattern black and white image) and video frames having recorded material (page 3, lines 17-28). For example, the border detection module (30) receives video data from a video data source (20) and analyzes the video data to identify certain video frames of the video data as a border between video frames containing recorded data content and video frames not containing recorded data content (page 6, lines 16-25, page 7, lines 1-3, 13-14 and 19-28, figure 2). Thus, independent claim 1 of the present application recites "analyzing a plurality of video frames, the plurality of video frames comprising recorded data content and unrecorded data content" and

"identifying at least one frame of the unrecorded data content as a border of the recorded data content." In the Final Office Action of the present application, the Examiner asserts that column 3, lines 5+ and column 4, lines 20+ disclose the elements of claim 1 (Final Office Action, pages 2-3, section 1). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Dettmer is directed to a method and apparatus for discerning between a television program and commercials (*Dettmer*, Abstract, lines 1-3). *Dettmer* is directed to a method and apparatus for detecting changes in signals between program and commercial segments of a television signal (*Dettmer*, column 2, lines 40-44). *Dettmer* apparently discloses that commercial segments of a television signal may be detected so that the commercial segments are either not recorded, skipped during playback, or not copied (*Dettmer*, column 4, lines 23-26). Thus, *Dettmer* does not disclose or even suggest "analyzing a plurality of video frames" where at least one of the video frames comprises "recorded data content" and at least one of the video frames comprises "unrecorded data content" as recited by Claim 1 of the present application. To the contrary, the signals evaluated in *Dettmer* contain only recorded data content either in the form of a program or a commercial.

In the Advisory Action of the present application, the Examiner states that the detection in *Dettmer* "of a commercial has a start and end points (i.e. borders) which are then recorded or not" (Advisory Action, page 2). However, the detected commercial in *Dettmer* is still the result of analyzing a signal having only data content (i.e., either program data content or commercial data content). Thus, in *Dettmer*, signals containing data content are analyzed, and then a determination is made whether to record the data content. Therefore, in *Dettmer*, a decision not to record data does not occur (become "unrecorded") until after the data content has been analyzed, in contrast to "analyzing . . . video frames . . . comprising . . . unrecorded data content" as recited by claim 1 of the present application. Further, because *Dettmer* apparently receives only signals having data content, there can be no identification of a border of unrecorded data content by *Dettmer*.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons discussed above, independent claim 1 of the present application is patentable over *Dettmer* because *Dettmer* does not disclose, teach or suggest the elements of independent claim 1.

Similarly, independent claims 9 and 15 of the present application stand rejected under 35 U.S.C § 102(b) as being unpatentable over *Dettmer*. Independent claim 9 recites "a border detection module . . . operable to receive a plurality of video frames . . . comprising recorded data content and unrecorded data content" and "analyze the plurality of video frames" to "identify at least one frame of the unrecorded data content as a border of the at least one recorded data content." Independent claim 15 recites "a border detection module" and "logic residing on the module, the logic operable to receive a plurality of video frames, the plurality of video frames comprising recorded data content and unrecorded data content, analyze the plurality of video frames, and identify at least one frame of the unrecorded data content as a border of the recorded data content." For at least the reasons discussed above in connection with independent claim 1, *Dettmer* does not disclose, teach or suggest the elements of either independent claim 9 or independent claim 15. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of claims 1, 9 and 15 based on *Dettmer* was improper, and that the claims of Group 1 (claim 1 and claims 2-7 that depend from claim 1; claim 9 and claims 10-13 that depend from claims 9; and claim 15 and claims 16-19 and 22 that depend from claim 15) are in condition for allowance.

C. Issue 1: Claims 23-28 (Group 2) are patentable over *Dettmer*.

Claims 23-28 (Group 2) stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Dettmer*. Of these claims, claim 23 is independent. Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 23 is patentable over *Dettmer*, and thus remaining claims 24-28 which depend from independent claim 23 are also patentable.

Independent claim 23 recites "a border detection module" and "logic residing on the module, the logic adapted to compare at least two video frames of the video data, the logic adapted to identify at least one of the two video frames as a border

between unrecorded data content of the video data and recorded data content of the video data if pixel values of the at least one of the two video frames corresponds substantially to a particular color." In the Final Office Action of the present application, the Examiner asserts that figure 9 of *Dettmer* discloses the elements of independent claim 23 (Final Office Action, page 7, section 10). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Dettmer states that "[b]efore commercials there has to be a sequence of separating images" which are "normally man-made with a computer and only use a few colors" (*Dettmer*, col. 12, lines 33-36). *Dettmer* also states that "two successive images" may be measured and that "[i]f the amount of pixels in which two images differ is low, then there is no significant change in the image content" (*Dettmer*, col. 12, lines 38-44). Thus, *Dettmer* distinguishes only between different types of data content (i.e., in the form of either program material or commercial material) by determining color variances between images. Thus, *Dettmer* fails to disclose, teach or suggest identifying a border between "unrecorded data content . . . and recorded data content . . . if pixel values" of at least one frame of the video data correspond substantially "to a particular color" as recited by claim 23 of the present application (emphasis added).

Accordingly, for at least the reasons discussed above, independent claim 23 of the present application is patentable over *Dettmer* because *Dettmer* does not disclose, teach or suggest the elements of independent claim 23. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of claim 23 based on *Dettmer* was improper, and that the claims of Group 2 (claim 23 and claims 24-28 that depend from claim 23) are in condition for allowance.

D. Issue 1: Claims 29 and 31-35 (Group 3) are patentable over *Dettmer*.

Claims 29 and 31-35 (Group 3) stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Dettmer*. Of these claims, claim 29 is independent. Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 29 is patentable over *Dettmer*, and thus remaining claims 31-35 which depend from independent claim 29 are also patentable.

Independent claim 29 of the present application recites "a border detection module" and "logic residing on the module, the logic adapted to compare at least two video frames of the video data, the logic adapted to identify at least one of the two video frames as a border between unrecorded data content of the video data and recorded data content of the video data if an amount of motion in one of the at least two video frames exceeds a predetermined threshold relative to another one of the at least two video frames." In the Final Office Action of the present application, the Examiner asserts that column 3, lines 10+ and lines 59+ of *Dettmer* discloses the elements of independent claim 29 (Final Office Action, pages 8-9, section 14). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Dettmer appears to disclose that a measure of the difference of two successive frames used for logogram detection may be used to detect different types of data content (i.e., commercial content or program content) (*Dettmer*, col. 3, lines 10-12, col. 4, lines 4-6). However, Applicant has not identified any disclosure in the Examiner-identified passages of *Dettmer* that discloses, teaches or suggests "identify[ing] . . . a border between unrecorded data content of the video data and recorded data content of the video data if an amount of motion in one of the at least two video frames exceeds a predetermined threshold relative to another one of the at least two video frames" as recited by independent claim 29 of the present application (emphasis added).

Accordingly, for at least the reasons discussed above, independent claim 29 of the present application is patentable over *Dettmer* because *Dettmer* does not disclose, teach or suggest the elements of independent claim 29. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of claim 29 based on *Dettmer* was improper, and that the claims of Group 3 (claim 29 and claims 31-35 that depend from claim 29) are in condition for allowance.

E. Issue 2: Claims 8, 14, 20 and 30 (Group 4) are patentable over *Dettmer* in view of *Nafeh*.

Claims 8, 14, 20 and 30 (Group 4) stand rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) in view of *Dettmer* in combination with *Nafeh*. The Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness because the proposed combination of references does not disclose, teach or suggest all the elements of claims 8, 14, 20 and 30. For example, claims 8, 14 and 20 of the present application recite "analyz[ing] motion vectors created from at least one of the plurality of video frames" and "determin[ing] from the motion vectors the at least one frame of unrecorded data content," and claim 30 of the present application recites "analyz[ing] motion compensation vectors to determine the amount of motion."

The Examiner admits that *Dettmer* does not disclose a method for analyzing motion vectors (Final Office Action, page 10, section 18). However, the Examiner also states that *Nafeh* discloses a method for analyzing vectors, and that it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to take the commercial detection system as disclosed by *Dettmer* and incorporate a method for analyzing vectors as disclosed by *Nafeh* (Final Office Action, pages 10-11, section 18). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Column 4, lines 45-47, of *Nafeh* recite that "peak detectors and amplifier may be replicated to provide different picture vectors." However, the vectors referred to in *Nafeh* are directed toward chrominance processing (*Nafeh*, column 4, lines 33-60), in contrast to "motion vectors" as recited by claims 8, 14, 20 and 30 of the present application. Thus, not only do claims 8, 14, 20 and 30 incorporate the limitations of the independent claims from which they respectively depend, but claims 8, 14, 20 and 30 also recite analyzing "motion vectors." Thus, *Dettmer* is deficient in at least this regard, and *Nafeh* fails to remedy or supply such deficiency. Accordingly, for at least this reason, the proposed combination of references does not disclose, teach or suggest the elements of claims 8, 14, 20 and 30 of the present application. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of claims 8, 14, 20 and 30 based on

the combination of *Dettmer* and *Nafeh* was improper, and that the claims of Group 4 (claims 8, 14, 20 and 30) are in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

Applicant has demonstrated that the present invention as claimed is clearly distinguishable over the art cited of record. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences to reverse the final rejection of the Examiner and instruct the Examiner to issue a notice of allowance of all claims.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge the statutory fee of $330.00 to Deposit Account No. 08-2025 of Hewlett-Packard Company. Although no other fee is believed due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 08-2025 of Hewlett-Packard Company.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 5-28-04

James L. Baudino
Registration No. 43,486

Correspondence To:
L. Joy Griebenow
Hewlett-Packard Company
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400
Tel. (970) 898-3884

APPENDIX A

1. A method for detecting the border of recorded video data, comprising:

analyzing a plurality of video frames, the plurality of video frames comprising recorded data content and unrecorded data content; and

identifying at least one frame of the unrecorded data content as a border of the recorded data content.

2. The method of claim 1, further comprising digitizing at least a subset of the plurality of video frames.

3. The method of claim 2, further comprising compressing the at least a subset of the digitized plurality of video frames.

4. The method of claim 2, further comprising formatting the at least a subset of the digitized plurality of video frames.

5. The method of claim 1, further comprising storing the recorded data content on optical storage media using a media storage system based on the identified border.

6. The method of claim 1, further comprising receiving at least a subset of the plurality of video frames from one of the group consisting of a video camcorder, video recorder, and a digital data stream.

7. The method of claim 1, further comprising:

creating a histogram of at least one of the plurality of video frames; and

determining from the histogram the at least one frame of unrecorded data content.

8. The method of claim 1, further comprising:

analyzing motion vectors created from at least one of the plurality of video frames; and

determining from the motion vectors the at least one frame of unrecorded data content.

9. A system for detecting the border of a video stream, comprising:

a video data source; and

a border detection module coupled to the video data source and operable to receive a plurality of video frames, the plurality of video frames comprising recorded data content and unrecorded data content, analyze the plurality of video frames, and

identify at least one frame of the unrecorded data content as a border of the at least one recorded data content.

10. The system of claim 9, further comprising a media storage system operable to store the recorded data content based on the identified border.

11. The system of claim 10, wherein the media storage system comprises optical storage media.

12. The system of claim 9, wherein at least a subset of the plurality of video frames is received from one of the group consisting of a video camcorder, video recorder, and a digital data stream.

13. The system of claim 9, wherein the border detection module is further operable to:

create a histogram of at least one of the plurality of video frames; and

determine from the histogram the at least one frame of unrecorded data content.

14. The system of claim 9, wherein the border detection module is further operable to:

analyze motion vectors created from at least one of the plurality of video frames; and

determine from the motion vectors the at least one frame of unrecorded data content.

15. An application for detecting a border of recorded video data comprising:

a border detection module; and

logic residing on the module, the logic operable to receive a plurality of video frames, the plurality of video frames comprising recorded data content and unrecorded data content, analyze the plurality of video frames, and identify at least one frame of the unrecorded data content as a border of the recorded data content.

16. The application of claim 15, wherein the logic residing on the module comprises at least one software application.

17. The application of claim 15, wherein the logic residing on the module comprises firmware.

18. The application of claim 15, wherein the logic is operable to:

create a histogram of at least one of the plurality of video frames; and

determine from the histogram the at least one frame of unrecorded data content.

19. The application of claim 15, wherein the logic is further operable to record the recorded data content onto an optical storage medium using a media storage system based on the identified border.

20. The application of claim 15, wherein the logic is further operable to:

analyze motion vectors created from the at least one of the plurality of video frames; and

determine from the motion vectors the at least one frame of unrecorded data content.

22. The application of claim 15, wherein at least a subset of the plurality of video frames is received from one of the group consisting of a video camcorder, video recorder, and a digital data stream.

23. A system for detecting a border of video data, comprising:

a border detection module; and

logic residing on the module, the logic adapted to compare at least two video frames of the video data, the logic adapted to identify at least one of the two video frames as a border between unrecorded data content of the video data and recorded data content of the video data if pixel values of the at least one of the two video frames corresponds substantially to a particular color.

24. The system of Claim 23, wherein the logic is adapted to initiate recording of the recorded data content onto a media storage system based on the border video frame.

25. The system of Claim 24, wherein the logic is adapted to format the recorded data content corresponding to a type of the media storage system.

26. The system of Claim 23, wherein the logic is adapted to compare the at least two video frames in real-time.

27. The system of Claim 23, wherein at least a subset of the at least two video frames is received from one of the group consisting of a video camcorder, video recorder, and a digital data stream.

28. The system of Claim 23, wherein the logic is adapted to create at least one histogram for comparing the at least two video frames.

29. A system for detecting a border of video data, comprising:

a border detection module; and

logic residing on the module, the logic adapted to compare at least two video frames of the video data, the logic adapted to identify at least one of the two video frames as a border between unrecorded data content of the video data and recorded data content of the video data if an amount of motion in one of the at least two video frames exceeds a predetermined threshold relative to another one of the at least two video frames.

30. The system of Claim 29, wherein the logic is adapted to analyze motion compensation vectors to determine the amount of motion.

31. The system of Claim 29, wherein the logic is adapted to initiate recording of the recorded data content onto a media storage system based on the border video frame.

32. The system of Claim 31, wherein logic is adapted to format the recorded data content corresponding to a type of the media storage system.

33. The system of Claim 29, wherein the logic is adapted to compare the at least two video frames in real-time.

34. The system of Claim 29, wherein the video data comprises compressed video data.

35. The system of Claim 29, wherein the at least two video frames is received from one of the group consisting of a video camcorder, a video recorder, and a digital data stream.

36. A system for detecting a border of video data, comprising:

means for receiving a plurality of video frames; and

means for identifying at least one of the plurality of video frames as a border between recorded data content of the video data and unrecorded data content of the video data.

37. The system of Claim 36, further comprising means for initiating storing of the recorded data content based on the border.

38. The system of Claim 36, further comprising means for determining whether pixel values for the border correspond substantially to a particular color.

39. The system of Claim 36, further comprising means for determining whether motion in at least one of the plurality of video frames exceeds a predetermined threshold relative to another one of the plurality of video frames.

40. The system of Claim 36, wherein the receiving means comprises means for receiving at least a subset of the plurality of video frames from one of the group consisting of a video camcorder, a video recorder, and a digital data stream.